

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 15, 2008 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 3, 4, 9, 9, and 16-20 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-20

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chrisop et al. (US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0043638) in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,784,698). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites “determining buffer requirements for the at least one active module.” Thus, claim 1 provides for determining the buffer requirements of an active module of a plurality of modules of a multiple function integrated circuit. The Office acknowledges at page 3 that these elements are not taught by Chrisop, and turns to column 2, line 57 through column 3, line 6 of Brady as disclosing these elements. However, the cited portion indicates only that a buffer can be allocated in response to a request. There is no disclosure in Brady that the request is associated with buffer requirements for an active module of a plurality of modules of a multiple function integrated circuit in any manner. Thus, Chrisop and Brady, individually and in combination, fails to disclose or renders obvious at least one element of claim 1.

With respect to claim 7, the claim recites “determining buffer requirements for the at least one active module.” For reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at these elements of claim 7.

With respect to claim 14, the claim recites “operational instructions that cause the processing module to... determine buffer requirements for the at least one active module.” For reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at these elements of claim 14.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. Claims 8-13 depend from claim 7. Claims 15-20 depend from claim 14. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least one element of each of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1, 7, and 14. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

To illustrate, claim 3 has been amended to recite “wherein the mode of operation comprises at least one mode of operation selected from the group comprising: a digital audio player mode; a digital multimedia player mode; an extended memory device mode; a digital audio recorder mode; a digital multimedia recorder mode; and a personal data assistant.” These features are not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited references, individually or in combination.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite “in response to determining the change in the mode of operation, determining buffer requirements for the at least one other active module.” Neither of the cited references discloses or renders obvious determining buffer requirements in response to determining a change in a mode of operation.

In addition, one skilled in the art would not combine the references as proposed because doing so would render Chrisop unsuitable for its intended purpose. *See MPEP, § 2143.01.* In particular, the stated purpose of Chrisop is to provide “a user interface, such as a front panel or web page, that permits a user to fine tune the RAM memory allocated for each component.” *Chrisop*, paragraph [0012]. Thus, the intended purpose of Chrisop is to allow a user to set buffer space allocated in memory. *Id.* However, Brady provides an algorithm to allocate buffer space by allocating predefined “buffer pools.” *Brady*, col. 6, lines 1-13. Because of the size of each buffer pool is predefined, more buffer space than was specifically requested may be allocated in response to a request. *Id.* Thus, the allocation algorithm of Brady sets buffer sizes according to the predefined pools, such that a user could not “fine tune” RAM memory allocated for a particular component. In other words, the proposed combination of Chrisop and Brady would result in a system whereby more buffer space than was specifically requested by a user would be allocated to a particular component. Such a system would not satisfy the express purpose of Chrisop. Thus, the proposed combination of cited references would result in render Chrisop

inoperable for its intended purpose. One skilled in the art would therefore not combine the references as proposed.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-20 and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicant believes no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-3797.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 439-7199 (fax)

December 15, 2008

Date